REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-13, 15-27 and 29-38 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21 and 24 have been amended. Claims 2 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,260,040 to Kauffman et al., hereafter Kauffman.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 11 has been amended to recite:

> "A computer readable medium having executable instructions stored thereon to perform a method in a life cycle process of determining permissions for actions with an object based on a user defined state of said object, wherein said life cycle process comprises a plurality of definitions of a plurality of user defined states and a plurality of user defined state transitions between the plurality of states, said method comprising:
> receiving a request to perform one of said actions with said object", and
> "retrieving from said plurality of definitions a definition of said user defined state of said object that corresponds to said action".

The Examiner contends that Kauffman's checked-in status and checked-out status are user-defined states. However, check-in and checkout are operations that are performed to read and write a version of the object in a version control system and not of a life cycle process as claimed in amended claim 11. Moreover, Kauffman does not disclose the combination of "determining permissions for actions with an object based on a user defined state of said object", "receiving a request to perform one of said actions with said object" and

"retrieving from said plurality of definitions a definition of said user defined state of said object that corresponds to said action". Moreover, Kauffman does not disclose "a plurality of user defined state transitions between the plurality of states". Kauffman merely discloses check-in and checkout operations for a version of an object.

Claims 12 and 13 recite methods of validating user defined state transitions. Kauffman does not disclose any user defined state transitions between user defined states a validation of such state transitions or "a user defined state transition model" as recited in claims 12 and 13. Moreover, Kauffman's check-in and check out functions are not user defined states.

Claim 13 has been amended by incorporating the language of canceled claim 14.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Kauffman is obviated by the amendment (claims 11 and 13) or erroneous (claim 12) and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,654,747 to Van Huben, hereafter Van Huben.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 16 has been amended to recite:

"determining a new state for a version of an object upon check-in in a user defined qualifications process that comprises a plurality of user defined qualification states by:

determining whether said version of said object is being checked-in for a first time;

retrieving a first fallback qualification state from said plurality of user defined qualification states for a first pre-defined qualification state, if said version of said object is being checked-in for said first time, wherein said fallback qualification state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process; and

providing said first fallback qualification state, if said object is being checked-in for said first time".

Van Huben does not disclose "determining a new state for a version of an object upon check-in in a user defined qualifications process that comprises a plurality of user defined qualification states" and the Examiner makes no indication of any portion of Van Huben that performs this step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "determining whether said version of said object is being checked-in for a first time", citing column 5, lines 31-42, column 7, lines 13-21, and column 12, lines 27-39. However, none of these citations, which describe check-in and checkout in general terms, mentions the recited step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "retrieving a first fallback qualification state from said plurality of user defined qualification states for a first pre-defined qualification state, if said version of said object is being checked-in for said first time", citing Fig. 5A and column 16, lines 1-14. However, neither Fig. 5A nor the column 16 citation mention the retrieval of "a first fallback qualification state from said plurality of user defined qualification states for a first pre-defined qualification state, if said version of said object is being checked-in for said first time". Rather, Van Huben's Figs. 5A and 5B relate to the editing of an algorithm by deleting three steps of the algorithm. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "wherein said fallback qualification state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process", citing column 14, lines 36-44 and column 15, lines 50-62. However, none of these citations mention "a fallback qualification state" or " a life cycle stage of said qualification process". Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "providing said first fallback qualification state, if said object is being checked-in for said first time", citing column 7, lines 13-21, column 16, lines 15-41 and column 14, lines 36-44. However, none of these citations mention "a fallback qualification state" or an object that is "being checked-in for said first time". Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

Accordingly, for the reason set forth above, amended independent claim 16 and its dependent claim 17 are not anticipated by Van Huben.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to recite:

"processing an addition of a new state to a life cycle qualification process comprising a plurality of user defined states by:

receiving a definition of said new state from a user, said definition including a name and a fallback state, wherein said fallback state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process;

determining whether said name is unique among existing state definitions of said plurality of user defined states;

validating said fallback state; and

adding said definition to a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid.

Van Huben does not disclose "processing an addition of a new state to a life cycle qualification process comprising a plurality of user defined states" and

the Examiner makes no indication of any portion of Van Huben that performs this step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "receiving a definition of said new state from a user, wherein said definition including a name and a fallback state, wherein said fallback state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process", citing column 16, lines 1-41, Fig. 5A and column 15, lines 50-62. However, this citation does not mention receiving a definition of the new state to be added to a life cycle qualification process. Rather, Van Huben's Figs. 5A and 5B relate to the editing of an algorithm by deleting three steps of the algorithm. The Examiner is apparently reading the recited fallback state on algorithmic step 12 of Fig. 5A and Fig. 5b. Step 12 merely posts an error message and is not a fallback state of a life cycle qualification process. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "determining whether said name is unique among existing state definitions of said plurality of user defined states", citing column Fig. 5A. Although the names of the algorithmic steps differ from one another, the citation does not mention the determining step. That is there is no disclosure that any determination concerning names is being made. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "validating said fallback state", citing Fig. 5A. The citation makes no mention of validating anything. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "adding said definition to a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid' citing Fig. 5A, column 16, lines 1-41. However, this citation describes a versioning system in general terms and does not mention any determination of

anything, or "a definition of anything" being added to the system. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "adding said definition to a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid' citing Fig. 5A, column 16, lines 1-41. However, this citation describes a versioning system in general terms and does not mention any determination of anything, or "a definition of anything" being added to the system. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

Accordingly, amended claim 18 and its dependent claims 19 and 20 are not anticipated by Van Huben.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite:

"processing a modification of a state of a plurality of user defined states of a user defined qualification process by:

receiving a modified definition of said user defined state from a user, said modified definition including a name and a fallback state, wherein said fallback state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process;

determining whether said name is unique among existing user defined state definitions;

validating said fallback state; and

updating said modified definition in a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid".

Van Huben does not disclose "processing a modification of a state of a plurality of user defined states of a user defined qualification process" and the Examiner makes no indication of any portion of Van Huben that performs this step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "receiving a modified definition of said user defined state from a user, said modified definition including a name and a fallback state, wherein said fallback state is a life cycle stage of said qualification process", citing Figs. 5A and 5B, column 16, lines 1-23. However, this citation does not mention receiving a modified definition of a user defined state from a user. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "determining whether said name is unique among existing user defined state definitions", citing column 14, lines 35-44 and column 15, lines 50-62. However, these citations do not mention the modification of a definition of a user defined state from a user as claimed. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "validating said fallback state", citing Figs. 5A and 5B, column 16, lines 14-23. However, this citation does not mention validation of anything. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

Van Huben does not disclose "updating said modified definition in a source control system, only if said name is unique and said fallback state is valid" and the Examiner makes no indication of any portion of Van Huben that performs this step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

Accordingly, amended claim 21 and its dependent claims 22 and 23 are not anticipated by Van Huben.

Independent claim 24 has been amended to recite:

"processing the deletion of a qualification state of a plurality of user defined qualification states in a life cycle process of a source control system by:

receiving a request to delete a qualification state definition for said qualification state from a user;

determining whether said qualification state definition is referenced by any other qualification state definition in said source control system;

determining whether any objects in said source control system have a current qualification state equal to said qualification state;

deleting said qualification state definition from said source control system, only if said qualification state definition is not referenced by any other qualification state definition in said source control system and no objects in said source control system have said current qualification state equal to said qualification state".

Van Huben does not disclose "processing the deletion of a qualification state of a plurality of user defined qualification states in a life cycle process of a source control system" and the Examiner makes no indication of any portion of Van Huben that performs this step. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "determining whether said qualification state definition is referenced by any other qualification state definition in said source control system", citing Fig. 5A, column 16, lines 15-41 and column 14, lines 36-44. However, these citations do not mention any "qualification state definition" or the determination as claimed. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "receiving a request to delete a qualification state definition for said qualification state from a user", citing Figs. 5A and 5B, column 16, lines 15-41. However, this citation does not mention "a qualification state definition for said qualification state from a user". Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses "determining whether any objects in said source control system have a current qualification state equal to said qualification state", citing column 12, line 59, to column 13, line 7, and column 15, lines 50-62. However, these citations do not mention any "qualification state" or any determination of equality. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

The Examiner contends that Van Huben discloses " deleting said qualification state definition from said source control system, only if said qualification state definition is not referenced by any other qualification state definition in said source control system and no objects in said source control system have said current qualification state equal to said qualification state", citing column 7, lines 13-21, column 12, lines 27-39, and column 14, lines 36-44. However, these citations do not mention any "qualification state definition" or its deletion from the source control system. Therefore, Van Huben lacks this step.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 24 and its dependent claim 25 are not anticipated by Van Huben.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Van Huben is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 26, 27, 29-34 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Kauffman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,885 to Dardinski, hereafter Dardinski.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"providing a check-in function to check-in at least one object of a control strategy for a process control system to said source control system;
providing a check-out function to check said object out of said source control system;
performing said life cycle process on said object of a control strategy for a process control system by subjecting said object when checked out to a plurality of user-defined states, each state having attributes".

The providing steps were previously recited in canceled claim 2. The Examiner contends that the recited plurality of user defined states are readable on Kauffman's check-in and check out functions. However, claim 1 has been amended to recite check-in and check out functions in combination with a plurality of user defined states of a life cycle process. Therefore, Kauffman's check-in and check out functions correspond to the recited check-in and check out functions and cannot also correspond to the recited plurality of user defined states. Moreover, Kauffman does not disclose any user-defined states. Kauffman's check-in and check out functions are not user-defined.

Furthermore, Kauffman lacks "subjecting said object when checked out to a plurality of user-defined states, each state having attributes". Kauffman uses the checkout function to check out an object and not to subject a checked out object to a plurality of states.

Independent claim 1 further recites:

"receiving user-defined state transitions between said plurality of states;
providing a change state function for a user to change a current one of said user-defined states to a next one of said user-defined states, said change state function verifying compliance with said user-defined state transitions".

Kauffman also lacks the recited user-defined state transitions and the change state function for a user to change a current one of the user defined states to a next one of the user-defined states.

Dardinski, which was cited for a different reason, does not supply the above noted deficiencies of Kauffman. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 3, 4, 6, 8-10 and 38 are unobvious in view of the combination of Kauffman and Dardinski.

With respect to independent claim 26, the Examiner admits that Kauffman lacks the recitals set forth at page12, but contends that Dardinski discloses them. This contention is mistaken. The citation at column 8, lines 24-59, discloses a control system for a process, but does not disclose "user-defined life cycle states for at least one object of a control strategy of a plurality of devices of said process control system". The citation at column 9, lines 31-51, discloses a control system for a process, but does not disclose "a state configuration component executable on said processor to receive state information from a user for each state". Therefore Dardinski does not supply Kauffman's admitted deficiencies of Kauffman.

Moreover, the Examiner's contention that Kauffman discloses additional recitals of claim 26 is mistaken. The citation at column 5, line 46, to column 6, line 21, does not disclose "said life cycle process component subjects said object to said user-defined life cycle states". The citation at column 4, line 41 to column 5, line 11, does not disclose " a state configuration component executable on said processor". Dardinski also does not disclose these additional recitals of Kauffman. Therefore Dardinski does not supply Kauffman's these additional deficiencies of Kauffman. Therefore, independent claim 26 and its dependent claims 27, 29-34, 36 and 37 are unobvious in view of the combination of Kauffman and Dardinski.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10, 26, 27, 29-34 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is either obviated by the amendment (claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10 and 38) or erroneous (claims 26, 27, 29-34, 36 and 37) and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 5 and 35 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Kauffman in view of Dardinski and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,000,118 to Murthy, hereafter Murthy.

This rejection of claim 5 is obviated by the amendment to independent claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. The combination of Kauffman and Dardinski lacks recited features of amended independent claim 1. Murthy, which was cited for a different reason, does not supply these features. Accordingly, the combination of Kauffman, Dardinski and Murthy also lacks these features.

This rejection of claim 35 is erroneous. As discussed above, the combination of Kauffman and Dardinski lacks recited features of independent claim 26, from which claim 35 depends. Murthy, which was cited for a different reason, does not supply these features. Accordingly, the combination of Kauffman, Dardinski and Murthy also lacks these features.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 5 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is either obviated by the amendment (claim 5) or erroneous (claims 35) and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 15 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Kauffman in view of Murthy.

Claim 15 recites executable instructions that "perform a method of validating a user defined transition of a life cycle process. Kauffman does not disclose any user defined state transitions. Murthy, which was cited for a

different reason, does not supply Kauffman's deficiency. Therefore, claim 15 is unobvious in view of the combination of Kauffman and Murthy.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 15 is either erroneous and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-13, 15-27 and 29-38 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5 AUG 2008

John Yankovich
Reg. No. 42,240
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500